

Analysis of the Strong Coupling Limit of the Richardson Hamiltonian using the Dyson Mapping

I. Snyman*

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Stellenbosch,
Private Bag X1, Matieland 7602, South Africa.*

and

*Instituut-Lorentz for Theoretical Physics, Universiteit Leiden,
P.O. Box 9506, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.*

H.B. Geyer†

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Stellenbosch,
Private Bag X1, Matieland 7602, South Africa.*

(Dated: February 6, 2008)

The Richardson Hamiltonian describes superconducting correlations in a metallic nanograin. We do a perturbative analysis of this and related Hamiltonians, around the strong pairing limit, without having to invoke the Bethe Ansatz solvability. Rather we make use of a boson expansion method known as the Dyson mapping. Thus we uncover a selection rule that facilitates both time-independent and time-dependent perturbation expansions. In principle the model we analyse is realised in a very small metallic grain of a very regular shape. The results we obtain point to subtleties sometimes neglected when thinking of the superconducting state as a Bose-Einstein condensate. An appendix contains a general presentation of time-independent perturbation theory for operators with degenerate spectra, with recursive formulas for corrections of arbitrarily high orders.

PACS numbers: 71.15.-m, 71.10.Ca, 74.20.-z

Keywords: strongly correlated fermions, superconductivity, boson expansion methods

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconduction correlations of electrons in weakly disordered metallic nano-grains^{1,2} are quite generally described by the Richardson Hamiltonian. This model was first introduced in the sixties in the context of nuclear physics^{3,4} and is Bethe Ansatz solvable. This means that the spectrum is known in terms of a set of parameters whose possible values are determined as the simultaneous roots of a large system of (non-linear) equations that have to be solved numerically.

Most studies of superconduction correlations in nano-grains therefore heavily rely on numerical solutions of the Bethe Ansatz equations for the Richardson Hamiltonian. What remained lacking was a simple intuitive picture of the low-energy physics of such grains, that would come from analytical rather than numerical studies. This was addressed by Yuzbashyan, Baytin and Altshuler⁵ who developed a strong coupling expansion based on the Bethe Ansatz solvability of the Richardson Hamiltonian. Thus the authors were able to compute the spectrum in orders of the the inverse of the pairing interaction strength.

In this paper we complement the work of Ref. 5 by expanding around the same limit but without relying on the Bethe Ansatz solvability of the Hamiltonian. As a result, perturbations that destroy the Bethe Ansatz solvability of the model can also be considered. Our strategy is to perform a so-called generalized Dyson boson-fermion mapping on the Hamiltonian. Generalized Dyson boson-fermion mappings,^{6,7,8,9,10} or Dyson mappings for short, are instances of boson expansion methods.^{11,12} A Dyson

mapping is an invertible linear transformation that maps a many-fermion system onto a system in which independent bosons and fermions are present. The bosons in the mapped system fulfill the role played by certain fermion pairs in the original system. For the Richardson Hamiltonian, zero-momentum spin singlet Cooper pairs are thus represented by bosons.

The paper has three main aims:

1. We want to extend the work of Yuzbashyan *et al* and build further on the intuitive picture for the low energy physics of superconducting nanograins by considering perturbations such as an external electric field that breaks the Bethe Ansatz solvability. We consider not only the spectrum, but also perform (zero-temperature) linear response calculations for time-dependent perturbations.
2. Superconductivity is often thought of as the Bose-Einstein condensation of Cooper pairs. However, Cooper pairs are not in themselves “fundamental” particles and can fairly easily be broken up into their constituent electrons by external perturbations. Viewing the superconducting state as a condensate of non- or weakly interacting bosons leads one into the temptation to suppose that the break-up of a Cooper pair is an event that does not depend on the state of the rest of the system. We point out that this picture is wrong due to the exclusion principle. Because Cooper pairs consist of fermions, a high density of Cooper pairs reduces the number of unoccupied single particle orbitals

into which the electrons resulting from Cooper pair break-up can decay. As a result, the linear response of the system to a pair-breaking perturbation is not extensive in the number of Cooper pairs.

3. We hope to convince readers of the utility and elegance of the Dyson Mapping as a tool for analysing the Richardson Model. To this end we uncover a selection rule for the matrix elements of single particle operators between eigenstates of the strong-pairing limit using the mapping. This selection rule seems to have gone unnoticed until now, possibly contributing to the assertion in Ref. 5 that a conventional perturbation analysis (not exploiting Bethe Ansatz solvability) is not feasible. Also, we show how the mapping simplifies the task of calculating certain non-zero matrix elements of one-body operators between correlated many-body states.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II takes care of preliminaries. The Richardson Hamiltonian and the Dyson mapping are introduced. The Hamiltonian obtained from the Dyson mapping when transforming (or mapping) the Richardson Hamiltonian is presented. In Section III we motivate our claim that the Dyson mapping facilitates an analysis of the Richardson Hamiltonian when the pairing term dominates the one-body term. In Section IV, a perturbative diagonalization in orders of the kinetic energy is discussed. We calculate the first three corrections to the ground state energy, and compare the results to those previously obtained.⁵ We also calculate the ground state expectation value of an arbitrary additive one-body operator to first order in the kinetic energy. Brief mention is made of results obtained for excited states. Section V is devoted to the study of time-dependent phenomena. The main calculation in this section yields the linear response of the expectation value of an arbitrary additive one-body operator to an external perturbation. An appendix contains a detailed exposition of Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory for operators whose unperturbed spectra are degenerate. The formalism is general enough to hold for non-hermitian operators and is presented in a way that makes it clear how to proceed in principle to arbitrarily high order corrections.

Surprisingly, we could not locate a ready source in the existing literature that presents degenerate perturbation theory in sufficient detail and general enough for present purposes. We have therefore included a more complete discussion in the appendix than is strictly necessary for the derivations in the main body of the paper.

II. HAMILTONIAN AND MAPPING

With the single particle states, $|\mu\sigma\rangle$, $\mu = -j, -j + 1, \dots, j - 1, j$; $\sigma = \pm$, we associate fermion creation and annihilation operators $a_{\mu\sigma}^+$ and $a_{\mu\sigma}$, that obey the usual anti-commutation relations. The index σ distinguishes

between spin up and spin down, while μ refers to momentum or some other quantum number, such that the state $|\mu, \sigma\rangle$ transforms to $|\mu - \sigma\rangle$ under time-reversal. The operators $a_{\mu\sigma}^+$ and $a_{\mu\sigma}$ act on fermion Fock space where we denote the vacuum by $|0\rangle$.

The Richardson Hamiltonian is constructed in the fermion space as follows. First an operator

$$S^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega}} \sum_{\nu=-j}^j a_{\nu+}^+ a_{-\nu-}^+, \quad (1)$$

is defined, with $\Omega = 2j + 1$ the number of single-particle orbitals. This choice normalizes $S^+ |0\rangle$ to unity. With the aid of the operator S^+ and its conjugate S , the Richardson Hamiltonian can be stated as

$$H = \sum_{\nu=-j}^j \epsilon_{\nu} (a_{\nu+}^+ a_{\nu+} + a_{-\nu-}^+ a_{-\nu-}) - GS^+ S. \quad (2)$$

It is time-reversal invariant and contains a one-body kinetic term and a two-body interaction or pairing term.

The Hamiltonian describes electron-electron interactions in weakly disordered metallic nano-grains.^{1,2} For simplicity, we have omitted the spin-exchange interaction, that should in principle be present as well; we are primarily interested in superconduction correlations. Since the spin-exchange term commutes with all other terms in the Hamiltonian, it is straight-forward to reintroduce it at a later stage if necessary. Its omission here does not represent a serious loss of generality.

The following mathematical features of the model are important.

A. The Seniority Limit

If the kinetic term is switched off, the Richardson model reduces to Racah's seniority model, so that we call this the seniority limit. The spectrum is explicitly known in the seniority limit.^{13,14} For a system with $2N$ particles, (with N an integer), the eigen-energies coalesce into $N + 1$ levels

$$E_s^{(0)} = -\frac{G}{\Omega}(N - s)(\Omega + 1 - N - s), \quad (3)$$

with $s = 0, 1, \dots, N$. Here the superscript is intended to indicate that this is the spectrum in the absence of the kinetic term. The ground-state, with $s = 0$ and energy $E_0^{(0)} = -GN(\Omega + 1 - N)/\Omega$ is non-degenerate. All other levels are highly degenerate. The energy difference (known as the superconducting gap) between the ground state and the (degenerate) $s = 1$ level of eigenstates is G . Up to normalization, the ground-state eigenvector is $(S^+)^N |0\rangle$.

B. Bethe-ansatz Solvability

It is possible to diagonalize the Richardson Hamiltonian beyond the seniority limit by exploiting the fact that it is Bethe-ansatz solvable. See for instance Appendix B of Ref. 1. We focus on diagonalization in the subspace of time-reversal invariant states. These are states for which no single particle state $(\mu\sigma)$ is occupied without the time-reversed state $(-\mu-\sigma)$ also being occupied. It can easily be shown that the Richardson Hamiltonian leaves this space invariant, and also that, if we know how to diagonalize the Richardson Hamiltonian in the time-reversal invariant subspace, the diagonalization in the whole fermion space can be achieved without further complication, thanks to the so-called blocking effect.

As a result of its Bethe-ansatz solvability, the following holds for the eigenstates and eigen-energies of the Richardson Hamiltonian in the time-reversal invariant subspace: for a system of $2N$ fermions, let $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^N$ be a set of complex numbers that satisfy the so-called Richardson equations

$$-\frac{\Omega}{G} = \sum_{\nu=-j}^j \frac{1}{E_k - 2\epsilon_\nu} + \sum_{l=1 \neq k}^N \frac{1}{E_l - E_k}, \quad (4)$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$. It can be shown that there are $\binom{\Omega}{N}$ such sets $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^N$, one for each dimension of the time-reversal invariant subspace. To each solution corresponds an eigenvector of the Richardson Hamiltonian, given by

$$|E\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{\nu=-j}^j \frac{a_{\nu+}^+ a_{-\nu-}^+}{2\epsilon_\nu - E_k} \right) |0\rangle, \quad (5)$$

up to normalization. The energy associated with this eigenstate is

$$E = \sum_{k=1}^N E_k. \quad (6)$$

Actually finding all the sets $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^N$ that solve the Richardson equations amounts to finding the simultaneous roots of N polynomials of N variables and degree $\Omega + N$. If either the number of single particle orbitals (Ω) or the number of fermions ($2N$) becomes too large, or if analytical rather than numerical results are required, the Richardson equations become an obstacle.

C. Strong Coupling Expansion

As a consequence, few explicit results have been derived for this model, and most studies involve numerical results based on the exact solution. To redress this state of affairs, Yusbashyan, Baitin and Altshuler (YBA) recently developed a perturbation expansion in inverse powers of the coupling constant G . With this expansion analytical results for the spectrum can be obtained away from the thermodynamic limit, $N, V \rightarrow \infty$,

where the discreteness of one particle levels becomes important. In principle, the strong pairing limit, considered by these authors, is realized in a small grain of ideal regular shape so that single electron levels are highly degenerate. In the case where the grain is so small that the energy distance between degenerate many-body levels is much larger than G , only the partially filled Fermi level is relevant. The kinetic term is simply a constant proportional to the total number of particles, and can be set equal to zero. Deviations from a perfectly regular shape slightly lifts the degeneracy of the Fermi level and is incorporated by treating the kinetic term as a perturbation.

Of course, in an irregularly shaped grain, the kinetic term cannot be viewed as a small perturbation to the pairing term. However, even in this regime a perturbative analysis of the strong coupling limit provides an intuitive insight into the nature of superconducting correlations. Whereas the pairing term cannot be treated perturbatively, because the radius of convergence for the expansion shrinks to zero in the thermodynamic limit, the $1/G$ expansion has a finite convergence radius. Evidence suggests that for realistic $1/G$ the system behaves qualitatively similar to the small $1/G$ limit.

In the next sections, we will do such a $1/G$ perturbative analysis of the model. Our expansion method complements that of Ref. 5, in that it does not rely on the Bethe-Ansatz diagonalization of the Hamiltonian. Thus, for instance, our method remains applicable when the kinetic term is replaced by an arbitrary one-body perturbation, even though the resulting Hamiltonian can no longer be diagonalized using the Bethe-Ansatz.

D. Mapping the Building Blocks of the Model

Our strategy involves mapping the Richardson Model onto an equivalent boson-fermion model, by means of the so-called Dyson mapping. The mapping uncovers some hidden features of the model and simplifies the task of calculating matrix elements of observables between correlated many-body states. (See the Refs. 10,15 for a more detailed discussion of the properties of the Dyson mapping.)

The operators S and S^+ are pseudo-spin ladder operators for an $SU(2)$ irreducible representation of dimension Ω , or in other words of total pseudo-spin j .^{5,13,14,16} As such, they have a lot in common with the boson creation and annihilation operators $B^\dagger$ and B , especially if Ω is large. The Dyson mapping is a linear invertible operator designed to replace the creation (annihilation) of Cooper pairs with the operator S^+ (S), with the creation (annihilation) of bosons. Without showing how the mapping is derived we simply give the (linear extensions of) the Dyson images of the components needed to construct a system described by the Richardson Hamiltonian. (See Ref. 15 for a complete discussion on how the Dyson mapping is defined as well as a derivation of the images of

the operators that constitute the building blocks of the Richardson Hamiltonian.)

$$(S)_D = B, \quad (7)$$

$$(S^+)_D = B^\dagger \left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{N}_F + \mathcal{N}_B}{\Omega} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$(a_{\nu\sigma})_D = \alpha_{\nu\sigma} + \sigma\sqrt{\Omega}B\alpha_{-\nu-\sigma}^\dagger \frac{1}{\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F} + \mathcal{S}^\dagger B\alpha_{\nu\sigma} \frac{\Omega}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F + 1)}, \quad (9)$$

$$(a_{\nu\sigma}^+)_D = \alpha_{\nu\sigma}^\dagger \frac{\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - \mathcal{N}_B}{\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\Omega}}B^\dagger\alpha_{-\nu-\sigma} - \sigma\sqrt{\Omega}\mathcal{S}^\dagger\alpha_{-\nu-\sigma} \frac{\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - \mathcal{N}_B}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F + 1)}. \quad (10)$$

In these expressions, $\alpha_{\nu\sigma}^\dagger$ and its conjugate are fermion operators, with the usual anti-commutation relations. We will refer to the particles created and annihilated by them as ideal fermions, to distinguish them from the fermions of the unmapped system. $B^\dagger$ and B are boson operators with the usual commutation relations. Importantly, the boson operators commute with the ideal fermion operators. Furthermore, $\mathcal{N}_F$ counts the number of ideal fermions, $\mathcal{N}_B$ counts the number of bosons and $\mathcal{S}^\dagger$ is defined as the operator S^+ with the real fermion operators $a_{\mu\sigma}^+$ replaced by ideal fermion operators $\alpha_{\mu\sigma}^\dagger$. The fermion vacuum $|0\rangle$ maps onto the boson-fermion vacuum $|0\rangle$, while the functional $\langle 0|$, maps onto a functional $\langle 0|$.

Note two subtleties of the mapping. Firstly it is not unitary, in the sense that $(X)_D^\dagger \neq (X^+)_D$. (We denote hermitian conjugation in the fermion space with a $+$ sign while in the boson fermion space we denote it with a $\dagger$, to emphasize that the mapping of the conjugate is not the same as the conjugate of the mapping.) This implies that a hermitian fermion operator such as H will in general be mapped onto a non-hermitian operator $(H)_D$. The equivalence between the Richardson Hamiltonian and the boson-fermion system is therefore a very formal mathematical one. It is not the physical equivalence between two systems that can both be realized in a (gedanken) laboratory. Secondly, the reader will have noticed the word “linear extension” used in connection with the Dyson images of fermion operators. The need for such terminology can be appreciated as follows: Recall first that the fermion Hilbert space on which the Richardson Hamiltonian is defined, was built up from a $2\Omega = 4j + 2$ dimensional one-particle Hilbert space. The operators used in the construction of the Richardson Hamiltonian therefore act on a finite dimensional vector space. Yet the Dyson image of the fermion operator S for instance is the boson-operator B . While S acts in a finite vector space,

B acts in an infinite-dimensional vector space: an infinite number of bosons can occupy the same state. What is happening here is that the operators in (10) leave a subspace of the full infinite dimensional boson-fermion space invariant. Within this subspace the operators of (10) are equivalent to the building blocks of the Richardson Hamiltonian. One might naively suppose that the physical subspace of boson fermion space is that in which twice the number of bosons plus the number of ideal fermions equal the number of real fermions. However, counting dimensions one sees that the dimension of this subspace of boson fermion space is still too large. The physical subspace is still smaller and its identification more subtle, but fully solved.¹⁵ While this brings about the complication that one should take care to choose initial and final states from this subspace, working in a larger than necessary Hilbert-space has advantages as well, as will become clear in the next section.

At this point it is still not obvious what one gains by performing a Dyson mapping on the Richardson Hamiltonian. This is addressed more fully in the next section. Note here, however, that the mapped operators have the following non-trivial but favorable properties:

1. A state containing $2N$ real fermions maps onto a state for which twice the number of bosons plus the number of ideal fermions is equal to $2N$.
2. The operator $(a_{\mu\sigma})_D$ only contains terms that annihilate an ideal fermion without changing the number of bosons or that annihilate a boson and create an ideal fermion. In fact, with the annihilation of a real fermion is associated three coherent processes in the mapped system. In the first an ideal fermion is annihilated, in the second a boson is annihilated while an ideal fermion is created, and in the third an ideal fermion and a boson is annihilated while an ideal fermion pair is created. No terms that change the boson number by more than one occur.

Similarly, the operator $(a_{\mu\sigma}^+)_{\mathcal{D}}$ can create an ideal fermion without changing the number of bosons or it can annihilate an ideal fermion and create a boson, but contains no terms that change the boson number by more than one.

3. Also, a real fermion many-body state in which all fermions occur in time-reversed pairs $a_{\mu+}^+ a_{-\mu-}^+$ maps onto a boson-fermion state in which ideal fermions only occur in time-reversed pairs $\alpha_{\nu+}^\dagger \alpha_{-\nu-}^\dagger$.
4. A real fermion state for which the number of real spin up fermions minus the number of real spin down fermions is M , maps onto a boson-fermion state for which the number of ideal spin up fermions minus the number of ideal spin down fermions is also M .

We stress that the extensions of the images of the operators that appear above are exact and complete as they stand. The expressions are not the first few terms in series of which ‘higher order’ terms have been neglected, nor was any other approximation made.

These building blocks can be combined to find the linear extension $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ of the image of the Richardson Hamiltonian. For the pairing term we simply get

$$P_{\mathcal{D}} = -G (S^+ S)_{\mathcal{D}} = -\frac{G}{\Omega} \mathcal{N}_B (\Omega + 1 - \mathcal{N}_B - \mathcal{N}_F). \quad (11)$$

Instead of immediately focusing on the image of the kinetic term in the Richardson Hamiltonian, we rather consider an arbitrary additive one-body operator

$$A = \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j A_{\mu\nu} (a_{\mu+}^+ a_{\nu+} + a_{\mu-}^+ a_{\nu-}), \quad (12)$$

that leaves the fermion space invariant²¹ and does not distinguish between spin up and spin down states. These two restrictions are not fundamental; they are imposed purely for the sake of simplicity. The linear extension of the image of A under the Dyson mapping can be conveniently separated into three parts $A_{\mathcal{D}} = A_{\mathcal{D}-} + A_{\mathcal{D}0} + A_{\mathcal{D}+}$, for which we have the following explicit expressions.

$$A_{\mathcal{D}-} = B^\dagger \xi_A \quad (13)$$

$$A_{\mathcal{D}0} = \mathcal{A} - \frac{\mathcal{N}_B}{\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F} (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}_* - 2 \text{tr}_1 \mathcal{A}) - \mathcal{S}^\dagger \xi_A \frac{(\Omega - 2\mathcal{N}_B - \mathcal{N}_F)\Omega}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F + 2)} \quad (14)$$

$$A_{\mathcal{D}+} = \xi_A^\dagger B \frac{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - \mathcal{N}_B)\Omega}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - 1)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)} + \mathcal{S}^\dagger B (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}_* - 2 \text{tr}_1 \mathcal{A}) \frac{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_B - \mathcal{N}_F)\Omega}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - 1)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)^2} - (\mathcal{S}^\dagger)^2 B \xi_A \frac{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_B - \mathcal{N}_F)\Omega^2}{(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F - 1)(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F)^2(\Omega - \mathcal{N}_F + 1)} \quad (15)$$

In these expressions, the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is defined, similar to $\mathcal{S}^\dagger$, as the operator A , with the real fermion operators $a_{\mu\sigma}^+$ and $a_{\mu\sigma}$ replaced by ideal fermion operators $\alpha_{\mu\sigma}^\dagger$ and $\alpha_{\mu\sigma}$. The operator $\mathcal{A}_* = \sum_{\mu\nu\sigma} A_{-\nu-\mu} \alpha_{\mu\sigma}^\dagger \alpha_{\nu\sigma}$ is the operator into which $\mathcal{A}$ transforms under time-reversal. The operator $\xi_A^\dagger$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_A^\dagger &= [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}^\dagger] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega}} \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j (A_{\mu\nu} + A_{-\nu-\mu}) \alpha_{\mu\nu}^\dagger \alpha_{-\nu-\mu}^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and ξ_A is its hermitian conjugate in the mapped boson-fermion space $\mathcal{H}_{BF}$. With $\text{tr}_1 \mathcal{A}$ we mean the trace $\sum_{\mu=-j}^j A_{\mu\mu}$ of the one-body matrix $A_{\mu\nu}$. The separation of $A_{\mathcal{D}}$ into three terms has been done in a way such that $A_{\mathcal{D}-}$ annihilates two ideal fermions and creates a boson while $A_{\mathcal{D}0}$ leaves both the number of bosons and ideal fermions unchanged and $A_{\mathcal{D}+}$ annihilates a boson and creates two ideal fermions.

From (13)-(15) it is clear that an additive one-body operator $A = \sum_{\mu\nu\sigma} A_{\mu\nu} a_{\mu\sigma}^+ a_{\nu\sigma}$ that is odd under time-reversal, i.e. $A_{\mu\nu} = -A_{-\nu-\mu}$, is simply mapped onto an operator $A_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{A} = \sum_{\mu\nu\sigma} A_{\mu\nu} \alpha_{\mu\sigma}^\dagger \alpha_{\nu\sigma}$. (Remember that hermitian operators that are odd under time-reversal are traceless.) This has the consequence that $A_{\mathcal{D}}$ commutes with $P_{\mathcal{D}} = -G (S^+ S)_{\mathcal{D}}$. That additive one-body operators that are odd under time-reversal commute with the pairing interaction, can also be checked without difficulty in the original system.

To summarize the most important points of this section then, there is a similarity transformation $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}$, known as the Dyson mapping, that maps many-fermion states onto states in which Cooper pairs are replaced by bosons. Any fermion operator X transforms into an operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}} X \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}$, defined on a subspace of the full boson-fermion Hilbert space and is said to be the image of X . We have presented linear extensions of the images of the building blocks of the Richardson Hamiltonian to the whole boson-fermion space. We denote the extended image of X un-

der the Dyson mapping as X_D . Somewhat carelessly we often call X_D the image of X under the Dyson mapping. Bra's and kets in the original fermion Hilbert space are written with angular brackets, while bra's and kets in the new boson-fermion Hilbert space are written with round brackets.

From the images of the operators in (7)-(10) the the image of the Richardson Hamiltonian under the Dyson mapping can be constructed (11), (13)-(15). In the next section we explain why it is useful to transform the Richardson Hamiltonian using the Dyson mapping if the pairing term dominates the one-body term.

III. THE UTILITY OF THE DYSON MAPPING

Let us diagonalize the image $P_D = -G(S^+S)_D$ of the pairing term, supposing that the original system contains $2N$ fermions. This implies that twice the number of bosons plus the number of ideal fermions equal $2N$ in the mapped system. Since the mapped pairing term (11) is clearly diagonal in boson-fermion space, we immediately find by simple inspection that any state in boson-fermion space that contains $N - s$ bosons and $2s$ ideal fermions is an eigenstate of P_D , with eigenvalue $E_s^{(0)} = -G(N - s)(\Omega + 1 - N - s)/\Omega$. This is exactly the same spectrum as that of the seniority model $P = -GS^+S$ on the fermion side, as is of course to be expected from a faithful mapping. However, if one counts the degeneracy of many-body levels, one finds that the mapped pairing term P_D has a higher degeneracy than the original pairing term P . For instance the degeneracy of the first level of excitations ($s = 1$) for P_D is $2\Omega^2 - \Omega$ while for P it is $2\Omega^2 - \Omega - 1$. This discrepancy is due to the fact that P_D is defined in a larger Hilbert space than P . One of the eigenstates in the $s = 1$ level of the spectrum of P_D is unphysical. The identification of this unphysical state and of all unphysical states in the other levels of the spectrum of P_D has been carried out elsewhere [15, p. 99]. The subspace of boson-fermion space on which the Dyson mapping establishes an equivalence with the Richardson Hamiltonian is completely known. For the purposes of the present text a full knowledge of this physical subspace is however not necessary.

A. An Important Selection Rule

We are now ready to state one of the main new technical results of our investigation which subsequently also turns out to be of great utility. Every eigenstate (and therefore every physical eigenstate) of P_D with energy $E_s^{(0)}$ contains $N - s$ bosons and $2s$ ideal fermions. As a remarkable consequence, the boson-fermion counterpart A_D of a one-body operator A only has non-zero matrix elements connecting states in a level $E_s^{(0)}$ with states in the levels $E_{s'}^{(0)}$ with $s' = s - 1, s, s + 1$. This is because

A_D does not change the number of ideal fermions by more than two. Because of the linearity and invertibility of the Dyson mapping, this result is equally true in the original system:

$$\langle E_s^{(0)} | X | E_{s'}^{(0)} \rangle = 0 \quad (17)$$

unless $s' \in s - 1; s; s + 1$, where $|E_s\rangle$ is any eigenstate from level s of the pairing operator $P = -GS^+S$ and similarly $|E_{s'}^{(0)}\rangle$ comes from level s' . X is any additive one-body fermion operator. Since this useful selection rule is not as immediately apparent in the original system, it seems to have gone unnoticed in the literature. With its aid the number of matrix-elements in a perturbation expansion for which non-trivial calculations are required is reduced by orders of magnitude.

B. The Advantage of a Larger Hilbert Space

When calculating matrix elements of operators, one often needs a spectral representation of the identity operator, or of a projection operator. (If $\{|k\rangle\}_{k=1}^M$ is an orthogonal basis for a vector space then $I = \sum_{k=1}^M |k\rangle \langle k|$ is a spectral representation of the identity operator.)

Now consider the somewhat artificial but helpful example of a three-dimensional vector space. Imagine that we are working in a 2-dimensional sub-space spanned by the two orthogonal vectors $|1\rangle = \sin\theta \sin\phi |x\rangle + \sin\theta \cos\phi |y\rangle + \cos\theta |z\rangle$ and $|2\rangle = \cos\phi |x\rangle - \sin\phi |y\rangle$. For vectors $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ in this subspace, the inner product $\langle\alpha|\beta\rangle$ can be written as $\langle\alpha|I|\beta\rangle$. The identity operator I has the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |1\rangle \langle 1| + |2\rangle \langle 2| \\ &= (\sin^2\theta \sin^2\phi + \cos^2\phi) |x\rangle \langle x| \\ &\quad - \cos^2\theta \sin\phi \cos\phi |x\rangle \langle y| + \text{seven similar terms} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Instead of this complicated expression, we are free to use the identity operator defined for the whole three dimensional space $I_{\text{extended}} = |x\rangle \langle x| + |y\rangle \langle y| + |z\rangle \langle z|$, since $\langle\alpha|I|\beta\rangle = \langle\alpha|I_{\text{extended}}|\beta\rangle$ for all $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\beta\rangle$ in the two-dimensional subspace.

This same advantage is to be had by working with the mapped instead of the original system: In any perturbation expansion where the pairing term is perturbed by a one-body operator A , typically quantities like $\langle\psi's'|A\Pi_{s_1}A\Pi_{s_2}\dots\Pi_{s_n}A|\psi s\rangle$ must be calculated. Here Π_s is the projection operator that singles out the component of the state it acts on in the space spanned by vectors that lie in level s of the spectrum of the unperturbed Hamiltonian. The vectors $|\psi s\rangle$ and $|\psi's'\rangle$ denote eigenstates from the levels s and s' respectively.

For simplicity, let us focus on the modestly non-trivial quantity $\langle GS|A\Pi_1A|GS\rangle$, which is encountered in the calculation of the second order correction to the ground state in the strong pairing limit. Here $|GS\rangle \propto (S^+)^N |0\rangle$

is the normalized ground state in the seniority limit. To make any head-way, an expression must be found for Π_1 . To do this, we need a complete basis for the $s = 1$ eigenspace. Finding such a basis is already a non-trivial task, and becomes progressively harder for larger values of s . It can be shown that any complete basis for the $s = 1$ eigenspace can be written in the form $\left\{ |k\rangle = (S^+)^{N-1} \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j c_{k\mu\nu} a_{\mu+}^+ a_{\nu-}^+ |0\rangle \right\}_{k=1}^{\omega_1}$, where ω_1

is the degeneracy of the level $s = 1$ and $c_{k\mu\nu}$ are complex numbers. (We only consider states with equal numbers of spin up and spin down fermions because the ground state contains as many fermions with spin up as spin down, and we have conveniently assumed A not to introduce spin flipping.) The projection operator Π_1 can then be written as $\Pi_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\omega_1} |k\rangle \langle k|$. This leaves us with the unpleasant task of calculating matrix elements such as

$$\langle GS | A | k \rangle = \langle 0 | S^N \left(\sum_{\mu\nu\sigma} A_{\mu\nu} a_{\mu\sigma}^+ a_{\nu\sigma} \right) (S^+)^{N-1} \left(\sum_{\rho\lambda} c_{k\rho\lambda} a_{\rho+}^+ a_{\lambda-}^+ \right) | 0 \rangle. \quad (19)$$

In order to do this calculation, the operators must be normal-ordered. As far as we can see, the operators A , S , S^+ and $\sum_{\mu\nu} c_{k\mu\nu} a_{\mu+}^+ a_{\nu-}^+$ do not belong to any useful algebra that would simplify the normal ordering. This means that, in the myriad commutation operations involved in normal ordering, new linear combinations of fermion operators that have not been encountered before are frequently generated. The result is that the number of non-trivial operations involved in calculating (19) grows explosively as N increases.

Let us now consider the calculation of $\langle GS | A \Pi_1 A | GS \rangle$, using the Dyson mapping. Firstly, by replacing S^+ with $(S^+)_D$ and S with S_D we find that

$$\mathcal{T}_D | GS \rangle = \mathcal{C} \frac{(B^\dagger)^N}{\sqrt{N!}} | 0 \rangle \equiv \mathcal{C} | - \rangle, \quad (20)$$

and

$$\langle GS | \mathcal{T}_D^{-1} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \langle 0 | \frac{B^N}{\sqrt{N!}} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \langle - |, \quad (21)$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ are complex numbers. The notation is intended to indicate that $| - \rangle$ contains no ideal fermions. Because it holds that $1 = \langle GS | GS \rangle = \langle GS | \mathcal{T}_D^{-1} \mathcal{T}_D | GS \rangle$, we know that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C} = 1$. Thus we find

$$\langle GS | A \Pi_1 A | GS \rangle = \langle - | A_D - A_{D+} | - \rangle. \quad (22)$$

In this expression, the image of $\Pi_1 A | GS \rangle$ is $\mathcal{C} A_{D+} | - \rangle$. The only part of $\langle GS | A \mathcal{T}_D^{-1}$ that has a non-zero overlap with this is $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \langle GS | A_{D-}$. To compute $\langle - | A_D - A_{D+} | - \rangle$, it is convenient to insert the identity operator in the $s = 1$ eigenspace (which is just a linear extension of

$\mathcal{T}_D \Pi_1 \mathcal{T}_D^{-1}$) between A_{D-} and A_{D+} . If we set $|\mu\nu_*\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(N-1)!}} (B^\dagger)^{N-1} \alpha_{\mu+}^\dagger \alpha_{\nu-}^\dagger | 0 \rangle$ then

$$\langle - | A_D - A_{D+} | - \rangle = \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j \langle - | A_{D-} | \mu\nu_* \rangle \langle \mu\nu_* | A_{D+} | - \rangle. \quad (23)$$

Here the notation $|\mu\nu_*\rangle$ is intended to indicate that the state contains two ideal fermions (and therefore $N - 1$ bosons), and further that one of the ideal fermions occupies the state labeled by $(\mu, +)$ for which μ is shorthand, while the other occupies the state $(-\nu, -)$ for which ν_* is shorthand. The matrix-elements in the above expression present no great challenge to compute. This is due to the fact that the bosons and ideal fermions have simpler commutation rules than the building blocks of states and operators on the fermion side. Particularly, ideal fermion operators commute with boson operators, as opposed to real fermion operators that have non-trivial commutators with the S^+ and S operators. It is true that things become significantly more complicated in the mapped system for levels s higher up in the spectrum. However, there is no ceiling or clear boundary beyond which calculations suddenly become impossibly complicated. For simplicity we will only calculate quantities that involve matrix-elements between states from the levels $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ in this paper, but calculations involving states from the level $s = 2$ are no less feasible. Only, the calculations become tedious and the results too intricate for casual interpretation.

We now write down all the matrix-elements that we are going to use in the rest of this paper.

$$\langle - | A_{D0} | - \rangle = 2N \frac{\text{tr}_1 A}{\Omega}, \quad (24)$$

$$(-|A_{D-}|\mu\nu_*) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{\Omega}} (A_{\nu\mu} + A_{-\mu-\nu}), \quad (25)$$

$$(\mu\nu_*|A_{D+}|-) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{\Omega}} \frac{\Omega - N}{\Omega - 1} \left(A_{\mu\nu} + A_{-\nu-\mu} - 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \frac{\text{tr}_1 A}{\Omega} \right), \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu'\nu_*|A_{D0}|\mu\nu_*) &= 2\frac{N-1}{\Omega-2} \text{tr}_1 A \delta_{\mu'\mu} \delta_{\nu'\nu} + \left\{ A_{-\nu'-\nu} - \frac{N-1}{\Omega-2} (A_{-\nu'-\nu} + A_{\nu\nu'}) \right\} \delta_{\mu'\mu} \\ &\quad + \left\{ A_{\mu'\mu} - \frac{N-1}{\Omega-2} (A_{\mu'\mu} + A_{-\mu-\mu'}) \right\} \delta_{\nu'\nu} \\ &\quad - \frac{\Omega-2N}{\Omega(\Omega-2)} (A_{\nu\mu} + A_{-\mu-\nu}). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Calculating the corresponding many-body matrix-elements in the unmapped system seems intractable to us.

IV. TIME-INDEPENDENT PERTURBATION THEORY

In this section we discuss the implementation of Rayleigh-Schrödinger (time-independent) perturbation theory for the linear extension H_D of the image of the Richardson Hamiltonian. The image K_D of the kinetic energy operator is treated as a perturbation to the image P_D of the pairing operator. The original kinetic energy operator K defined on fermion space is an additive one-body operator with one-body matrix elements $K_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu$. It is assumed to be time-reversal invariant, i.e. $\epsilon_\mu = \epsilon_{-\mu}$. We focus on the first few corrections to the ground state energy and eigenvector. Brief mention is made of the procedure involved in the expansion for the degenerate excited states.

In a recent paper by Yuzbashyan and co-workers,⁵ a procedure was presented for determining the eigenvalues perturbatively. The strategy there was to develop an expansion for $\sum_{k=1}^N E_k$ where E_k , $k = 1, \dots, N$ satisfy the Richardson equations (4). We do not claim that the method described in this section is easier to implement than the method of Ref.5 if one only wants to calculate corrections to the energies. What we do claim is that Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation theory is simpler to implement than the authors of Ref.5 may have realized. This we attribute to the structure resulting from the Dyson mapping, as we proceed to show. With our procedure, it is feasible to calculate the first few corrections to eigenstates at the bottom of the spectrum. Thus, our procedure allows one to compute, for instance, the first few corrections to the ground state expectation values of observables.

A. Ground State Energy

As a demonstration that the formulas of the previous section are valid, we will start by calculating the first three corrections to the ground-state energy, and compare the results with those obtained by Yuzbashyan and co-workers. The general formulas for these corrections (from the appendix) are

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(1)} = (-|K_D|-), \quad (28)$$

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(2)} = (-|K_D Q_{GS} K_D|-), \quad (29)$$

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(3)} = (-|K_D Q_{GS} (K_D - \Delta_{GS}^{(1)}) Q_{GS} K_D|-). \quad (30)$$

Here Q_{GS} is a linear operator defined through its image on eigenstates of the mapped pairing operator P_D as follows.

$$Q_{GS}|\psi, s\rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \frac{1}{E_0^{(0)} - E_s^{(0)}} |\psi, s\rangle & \text{if } s > 0 \end{cases}, \quad (31)$$

for any state $|\psi, s\rangle$ with $N - s$ bosons and $2s$ ideal fermions. Using the decomposition $K_D = K_{D-} + K_{D0} + K_{D+}$ together with this definition of Q_{GS} , we can replace (28)-(30) by

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(1)} = (-|K_{D0}|-), \quad (32)$$

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(2)} = (-|K_{D-} K_{D+}|-), \quad (33)$$

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(3)} = (-|K_{D-} (K_{D0} - \Delta_{GS}^{(1)}) K_{D+}|-). \quad (34)$$

(Remember that $E_1^{(0)} - E_0^{(0)} = 1$.) Immediately, we have from (24) that

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(1)} = 2N\bar{\epsilon}, \quad (35)$$

where, in general, $\bar{\epsilon}^k = \sum_{\mu=-j}^j \epsilon_\mu^k / \Omega$. In order to calculate $\Delta_{GS}^{(2)}$ and $\Delta_{GS}^{(3)}$, we insert appropriate representations of the identity operator to reduce the expressions in (33) and (34) to sums over the matrix-elements in (24)-(27). For the second order correction we find

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu=-j}^j (-|K_{D-}|\mu\mu_*)(\mu\mu_*|K_{D+}|-), \quad (36)$$

where the matrix elements are $(-|K_{D-}|\mu\mu_*) = 2\sqrt{N/\Omega}\epsilon_\mu$ and $(\mu\mu_*|K_{D+}|-) = 2\sqrt{N/\Omega}(\epsilon_\mu - \bar{\epsilon})$. The fact that, in the sum over states, only states $|\mu\mu_*)$ whose ideal fermions form time-reversal invariant pairs appear, can be traced back to the time-reversal invariance of the original kinetic energy operator K . Hence we find

$$\Delta_{GS}^{(2)} = -\frac{4N(\Omega - N)}{G(\Omega - 1)}\overline{(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^2}. \quad (37)$$

To calculate the third order correction, we need the additional matrix elements $(\mu\mu_*|K_{D0} - \Delta_{GS}^{(1)}|\nu\nu_*) = 2\frac{\Omega-2N}{\Omega-2}\{(\epsilon_\mu - \bar{\epsilon})\delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\epsilon_\nu}{\Omega}\}$. Thus we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{GS}^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{G^2} \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j (-|K_{D-}|\mu\mu_*)(\mu\mu_*|K_{D0} - \Delta_{GS}^{(1)}|\nu\nu_*)(\nu\nu_*|K_{D+}|-) \\ &= \frac{8N(\Omega - N)(\Omega - 2N)}{G^2\Omega(\Omega - 1)(\Omega - 2)} \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j \epsilon_\mu \left\{ (\epsilon_\mu - \bar{\epsilon})\delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\epsilon_\nu}{\Omega} \right\} (\epsilon_\nu - \bar{\epsilon}) \\ &= \frac{8N(\Omega - N)(\Omega - 2N)}{G^2(\Omega - 1)(\Omega - 2)}\overline{(\epsilon - \bar{\epsilon})^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

After converting the notation used in this paper to the notation of Ref. 5, namely $N \rightarrow M$, $\Omega \rightarrow N$, $\bar{\epsilon}^k \rightarrow 2^{-k}s_k/N$ and $G \rightarrow N\lambda d$, we find our first and second order corrections agreeing with those in Ref. 5. The seemingly different third order corrections are the result of a small arithmetic or typing error in Ref. 5. It is not hard to check explicitly that the method of Ref. 5, when implemented correctly, does indeed yield the same answer as we get in (38)

B. Grounstate Eigenvector and Expectation Values

Let us now calculate the first order correction to the ground-state eigenvector. (To us it is not clear whether this can be calculated using the method of Ref. 5.) Since the perturbation is not hermitian, a distinction must be made between the left and right perturbed eigenvectors. (Such a distinction was not necessary for the unperturbed ground-state as the unperturbed operator P_D happened to be hermitian.) The right ground-state eigenvector of the perturbed operator $K_D + P_D$ is, to first order, $|GS_R\rangle = |-\rangle + |GS_R^{(1)}\rangle$ whereas the left ground state eigenvector is $|GS_L\rangle = |-\rangle + |GS_L^{(1)}\rangle$, also to first order. Here $|GS_L\rangle$ is defined to be the ground-state eigenvector of $(K_D + P_D)^\dagger$.

According to the appendix, the first order correction for the right-eigenvector is

$$\begin{aligned} |GS_R^{(1)}\rangle &= Q_{GS}K_D|-\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{G}K_{D+}|-\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2\sqrt{\frac{N}{\Omega}}\frac{\Omega - N}{\Omega - 1} \sum_{\mu=-j}^j \frac{\bar{\epsilon} - \epsilon_\mu}{G} |\mu\mu_*\rangle, \quad (39)$$

where the second line follows from the selection rule for the matrix-elements of the images of additive one-body operators explained in Section III. Similarly we have for the left eigenvector

$$\begin{aligned} |GS_L^{(1)}\rangle &= Q_{GS}K_D^\dagger|-\rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{G}K_{D-}^\dagger|-\rangle \\ &= -2\sqrt{\frac{N}{\Omega}} \sum_{\mu=-j}^j \frac{\epsilon_\mu}{G} |\mu\mu_*\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

At this point we emphasise that the eigenvectors found above are physical. If one were for instance to find the ground state perturbatively to first order for the original fermion Hamiltonian and then apply the Dyson mapping, one would obtain the above right-eigenvector. In general, implementation of exactly mapped operators obtained from the Dyson mapping do not *per se* introduce spurious components. It is only when the Hamiltonian is diagonalized in the complete boson (or boson-fermion) Fock space, rather than in the physical subspace, that spurious states may be obtained. While the physical subspace may be obtained *ab initio* via the mapping of a basis in the original space, this would nullify the relative simplicity obtained when using a standard basis for the complete boson (or boson-fermion) space. Nevertheless, if the Hamiltonian is mapped exactly, as we do here, (i.e. without any truncation of degrees of freedom), the resulting eigenstates neatly separate into completely physical states and states with spurious components, and a

number of ways exist to distinguish these (see e.g. Refs. 17,18). For the Richardson Hamiltonian this is done in a novel way – see Ref. 15, p. 99. The neat division between completely physical states and states with spurious components still holds when the mapped Hamiltonian is diagonalized perturbatively in the kinetic term, as is explained in detail in the last paragraph of the appendix.

To calculate higher order corrections to these eigenvectors, we need to know matrix elements between higher excited states. Specifically, for the second order corrections, matrix elements of the kinetic term between states in the

$s = 1$ and $s = 2$ levels are required. We will however not proceed beyond the corrections already calculated.

Let us calculate the ground state expectation value for a one-body additive operator A to first order in the perturbation. It holds that $\langle GS|A|GS\rangle = \mathcal{C}(GS_L|A_D|GS_R)$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a normalization constant such that $1 = \mathcal{C}(GS_L|GS_R)$. Since it already holds that $(GS_L|GS_R) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_\mu^2/G^2)$, and we are interested in corrections of order ϵ_μ/G , we can take $\mathcal{C} = 1$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle GS|A|GS\rangle &= (-|A_{D0}|-) + (GS_L^{(1)}|A_{D+}|-) + (-|A_{D-}|GS_R^{(1)}) \\ &= 2N\bar{A} + \frac{4N(\Omega - N)}{G(\Omega - 1)} \left(\bar{\epsilon}\bar{A} - \frac{\sum_{\mu=-j}^j \epsilon_\mu A_{\mu\mu}}{\Omega} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $\bar{A} = \text{tr}_1 A/\Omega$.

We briefly discuss this novel result: Superconductivity is often presented as the Bose-Einstein condensation of Cooper pairs. The ground state contains all electrons bound into Cooper pairs with all Cooper pairs in the same quantum mechanical state. The first term in (41) confirms this picture: each Cooper pair contributes $2\bar{A}$ to the expectation value. One could then easily suppose that the kinetic perturbation breaks up Cooper pairs, and that each Cooper pair can be broken up independently from all the others, so that the first order correction should also be extensive, i.e. proportional to the number of Cooper pairs in the ground state. However the first order correction is actually proportional to $N(\Omega - N)$. The fundamental reason for this N -dependence is blocking through the exclusion principle. There are only 2Ω states for the fermions making up the Cooper pairs in the original system to occupy. Therefore, when there are $2N$ electrons, all one-particle states are full, and no rearrangement of electrons is possible. In this case the perturbation has no effect. In the mapped system this “taking account of the exclusion principle” manifests itself in the complicated images of the kinetic operator that introduce interactions of ideal fermions with bosons and with other ideal fermions. The deviation from bosonic behavior where the breakup of Cooper pairs is concerned will be encountered again in the remainder of this text where we will further comment on it.

As a very simple application of (41), we find the probability P_ρ for the single particle orbital ρ to be occupied, by calculating the ground-state expectation value of $(a_{\rho+}^\dagger a_{\rho+} + a_{\rho-}^\dagger a_{\rho-})/2$. According to (41) we have

$$P_\rho = \frac{N}{\Omega} + \frac{2N(\Omega - N)}{G(\Omega - 1)} (\bar{\epsilon} - \epsilon_\rho). \quad (42)$$

As the kinetic term is switched on, single-particle orbitals

with below-average kinetic energies are populated with a higher probability, in order to get a smaller kinetic energy contribution. In other words, the distribution in (42) is the result of a competition between the pairing term, that strives for a distribution where all single particle orbitals are equally likely to be occupied, and the kinetic term, that would like to populate the N one-particle orbitals whose kinetic energies are the lowest. This picture still qualitatively conforms to our intuition for a realistic superconductor in which the kinetic term cannot be viewed as a small perturbation to the pairing term. This suggests that insights gained in an investigation of the strong pairing limit gives qualitative information about superconducting correlations in a real superconductor.

V. TIME-DEPENDENT PERTURBATION THEORY

This section is devoted to the perturbative treatment of time-dependent phenomena. We consider a system that, in the absence of any perturbation, is described by the pairing Hamiltonian in the seniority limit $P = -GS^+S$. At a time $t = 0$ a perturbation of the form

$$V = \sum_{\mu,\nu=-j}^j V_{\mu\nu} (a_{\mu+}^\dagger a_{\nu+} + a_{\mu-}^\dagger a_{\nu-}), \quad (43)$$

is switched on.

We will calculate the linear response of the expectation value of an additive one-body operator A to this perturbation. From standard time-dependent perturbation

tion theory follows that, to first order in the perturbation

$$\langle A \rangle(t) = \langle i | A_I(t) | i \rangle + \frac{1}{i\hbar} \int_0^t dt' \langle i | [A_I(t), V_I(t')] | i \rangle, \quad (44)$$

where $A_I(t) = \exp(iPt/\hbar) A \exp(-iPt/\hbar)$ and a similar definition holds for V_I . Here $|i\rangle$ is the state the system was in at time $t = 0$, which we will take to be the unperturbed ground state $|i\rangle \propto (S^+)^N |0\rangle$. Note that if A commutes with the unperturbed Hamiltonian P , and $|i\rangle$ is a non-degenerate eigenstate of P , then it is also an eigenstate of $A_I(t)$, and hence the expectation value of the commutator in (44) vanishes. Thus, any additive one-body operator such as the current operator that is odd under time-reversal and therefore commutes with P (see the discussion following (15) in Section II) has no linear response to an external perturbation such as V .

To compute the matrix elements involved in (44), we will work with the mapped system. Consider for instance

$$\langle i | A_I(t) V_I(t') | i \rangle = (- | A_{ID}(t) V_{ID}(t') | -), \quad (45)$$

where $A_{ID}(t) = \exp(iP_D t/\hbar) A_D \exp(-iP_D t/\hbar)$ and a similar expression holds for $V_{ID}(t')$. On the right-hand side of (45), we can insert the identity operator in its spectral representation in the boson-fermion Hilbert space, between A_{ID} and V_{ID} . The operators A_{ID} and V_{ID} , just like their ‘Schrödinger’ analogues, only have non-zero matrix elements between eigenstates of the unperturbed Hamiltonian that lie in the same or adjacent

levels. Hence the sum over states in the spectral representation of the identity operator may be restricted to the levels $s = 0$ and $s = 1$. As it can easily be seen that the $s = 0$ contributions from the two terms in the commutator cancel we focus on the $s = 1$ terms such as

$$\sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j (- | A_{ID}(t) | \mu\nu_*) (\mu\nu_* | V_{ID}(t') | -). \quad (46)$$

The states $|\mu\nu_*\rangle$ as defined in Section IV have two ideal fermions, one with spin pointing up and one with spin pointing down. This is the only possibility we need to include, because the operators A and V are assumed to be unable to cause spin flipping. This guarantees that their images, when acting on $|-\rangle$ only create ideal fermion excitations with as many spins pointing up as pointing down.

Since $|-\rangle$ and $|\mu\nu_*\rangle$ are eigenstates of the image of the unperturbed Hamiltonian P_D , we have

$$(- | A_{ID}(t) | \mu\nu_*) = \exp \frac{-iGt}{\hbar} (- | A_{D-}(t) | \mu\nu_*), \quad (47)$$

$$(\mu\nu_* | A_{ID}(t) | -) = \exp \frac{iGt}{\hbar} (\mu\nu_* | A_{D+}(t) | -), \quad (48)$$

and similarly for the matrix elements of $V_{ID}(t')$, G being the energy difference between the $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ levels (3). Thus it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle i | [A_I(t), V_I(t')] | i \rangle &= \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j \exp \frac{iG(t'-t)}{\hbar} (- | A_{D-}(t) | \mu\nu_*) (\mu\nu_* | V_{D+}(t') | -) \\ &\quad - \exp \frac{iG(t-t')}{\hbar} (- | V_{D-}(t') | \mu\nu_*) (\mu\nu_* | A_{D+}(t) | -). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

At this point the calculation becomes a matter of substituting the correct expressions for the matrix elements and integrating over t' . Finally we find, to first order in V

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \rangle(t) &= 2N \frac{\text{tr}_1 A}{\Omega} + \frac{4N(\Omega - N)}{G\Omega(\Omega - 1)} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \frac{4 \text{tr}_1 A \text{tr}_1 V}{\Omega} - \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j (A_{\mu\nu} + A_{-\nu-\mu}) (V_{\nu\mu} + V_{-\mu-\nu}) \right\} \sin^2 \frac{Gt}{2\hbar}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Note again the $N(\Omega - N)$ factor in front of the first-order correction. As was explained in the section on time-independent perturbation theory, this factor accounts for exclusion-principle related deviations from bosonic behaviour by the Cooper pairs. In the context of the perfectly regular metallic nanograin this has the following implication: Let us suppose that the degeneracy 2Ω of the partially filled Fermi-level is large compared to the

number N of Cooper pairs. If we increase the number of Cooper pairs by adding electrons to the system while keeping the temperature fixed, the linear response to (say) an external electrical field initially grows, but not linearly. The increase in the linear response with an increase of particles tapers off as more electrons are added. When the Fermi-level is half-filled the addition of another Cooper pair does not change the linear response

of the system at all. Then, as more Cooper pairs are added, the linear response actually decreases.

To see if the result (50) makes sense, we consider a one-dimensional system of $2N$ particles on a ring of length L (with periodic boundary conditions). In this case the index $\nu \in -j, -j+1, \dots, j$ is an integer, labeling a one-particle wave function $\phi_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \exp(2\pi i \mu x/L)$. We will take V to be the external potential $V(x) = V_0 \cos(2\pi x/L)$, so that $V_{\mu\nu} = V_0(\delta_{\mu,\nu+1} + \delta_{\mu+1,\nu})/2$. We will calculate the linear response of the density-of-particles operator

$$\rho(x) = \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j \phi_\mu^*(x) \phi_\nu(x) (a_{\mu+}^+ a_{\nu+} + a_{\mu-}^+ a_{\nu-}), \quad (51)$$

so that $\rho_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{1}{L} \exp \frac{2\pi i(\nu-\mu)x}{L}$. One may ask if it is sensible to calculate the linear response of the density of particles. After all, the current has no linear response. Would the continuity equation $-d\rho/dt = dj/dx$ not imply that the density should then also have a zero linear response to V ? It would, but the continuity equation simply does not hold for the pairing Hamiltonian. (Recall that the continuity equation is usually derived for a Hamiltonian with a momentum-squared one-body kinetic term and a two-body inter-particle potential that depends on the distance between pairs of particles only. The pairing Hamiltonian P looks nothing like this.)

We consider the cut-off j to have some physical origin, as opposed to it being the result of a regularization procedure. For instance, for a large or irregular grain, $2\pi^2 j^2 \hbar^2 / mL^2$ would be set equal to the Debye energy of the lattice. For a small regular grain it is equal to the degeneracy of the partially filled Fermi-level. The cut-off is finite and will not be sent to infinity at the end of the calculation. Strictly speaking, the operators ρ and V do not leave invariant the fermion space of states with one-particle indices inside the cut-off only. For instance, V has, among others, a non-zero one-body matrix element $V_{j,j+1}$. It is entirely possible to extend the formalism we have developed to accommodate this situation. However, this only leads to small corrections if the cut-off is large. We therefore simply set the offending matrix elements $V_{\pm j, \pm j \pm 1}$ and $V_{\pm j \pm 1, \pm j}$ equal to zero.

We first compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j (\rho_{\mu\nu} + \rho_{-\nu-\mu}) (V_{\nu\mu} + V_{-\mu-\nu}) \\ &= \frac{2V_0}{L} \sum_{\mu\nu=-j}^j \cos \frac{2\pi(\nu-\mu)x}{L} (\delta_{\nu,\mu+1} + \delta_{\mu,\nu+1}) \\ &= \frac{4V_0}{L} (\Omega - 1) \cos \frac{2\pi x}{L}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The third line was obtained from the second by noting that there are $2j = \Omega - 1$ terms in the summation over μ and ν , namely $(\mu, \nu) = (-j+1, -j), (-j+2, -j+1), \dots, (j, j-1)$ such that $\delta_{\mu,\nu+1}$ is not zero, and similarly

for $\delta_{\mu+1,\nu}$. Noting that $\text{tr}_1 V = 0$, we therefore find that the general formula of (50) becomes

$$\langle \rho \rangle(t) = \frac{2N}{L} - 16 \frac{NV_0}{LG} \left(1 - \frac{N}{\Omega}\right) \cos \frac{2\pi x}{L} \sin^2 \frac{Gt}{2\hbar}, \quad (53)$$

in this specific instance. The spatial factor $-\cos(2\pi x/L)$ indicates that, as expected, particles disperse from the potential hill and accumulate in the potential valley.

As another application of time-dependent perturbation theory, we consider a system that, before time $t = 0$, is described by the Richardson Hamiltonian, but with the pairing constant G so large that the one-body kinetic term could be ignored. The system is assumed to be in the seniority limit ground state $|GS\rangle \propto (S^+)^N |0\rangle$ at $t = 0$. Then, at time $t = 0$, the pairing interaction strength is reduced to a value such that the kinetic term has to be taken into account. Such a tunable pairing interaction might for instance be encountered if our system is an ultra-cold trapped atomic Fermi gas. We mention in passing that recently the pairing Hamiltonian $P = -GS^+S$ was discussed in precisely this context.¹⁹ With the aid of the Dyson mapping the following result is easily obtained. The probability for the system to be found in the seniority limit ground state at a time t after the pairing strength was lowered, is to first non-trivial order in the kinetic energy

$$P_{GS \rightarrow GS} = 1 - 16N \frac{\Omega - N}{\Omega - 1} \frac{\bar{\epsilon}^2 - \bar{\epsilon}^2}{G^2} \sin^2 \frac{Gt}{2\hbar}. \quad (54)$$

In this expression, the by now familiar $N(\Omega - N)$ factor instead of simply N again confirms that the likelihood that a Cooper pair will break up into unpaired fermions depends on the number of available unoccupied states for the electrons to scatter into, and hence on the number of Cooper pairs in the system.

A matter that has not been addressed yet, is how to vary the number of Cooper pairs in the ground state without varying the number of available states Ω . While changing the occupancy of the degenerate Fermi level in a very small, regular nano-grain is feasible, the ratio N/Ω in most other systems is not under experimental control. Rather, the one-particle levels involved in Cooper-pairing lie in a symmetric window above and below the Fermi-energy. The size of the window is determined by the electron-phonon interaction, and of the order of the Debye energy, i.e. $\sim 10^{-2}$ eV. However, suppose one could find a system where the Fermi-energy is very close to the bottom or top of the conduction band. We will discuss the case of a Fermi-energy close to the bottom of the band. This could be attained in an electron doped semiconductor. By varying the doping concentration one can shift the Fermi-energy up or down. Thus a situation can be realized where the energy-window for levels to participate in Cooper-pairing extends below the conduction band. There will then be fewer occupied levels than unoccupied levels in the energy-window, simply because there are no states in the section of the window that extends

below the conduction band. The ratio N/Ω will be less than a half, and furthermore, it is tunable: by varying the doping concentration, the number of electrons in the conduction band, and hence the Fermi-energy and the number of states within the relevant energy window can be increased or decreased. Of course, one needs to find a semi-conductor in which the lack of screening of the electron-electron interaction does not override the pairing interaction.

VI. SUMMARY

The salient points in this paper are the following. We used the Dyson mapping as a similarity transform to map the Richardson Hamiltonian onto an equivalent boson-fermion Hamiltonian. This Hamiltonian uses bosons to describe the bound fermion pairs that result from the pairing interaction, instead of the time-reversed collective fermion pairs created by the operator S^+ . From the structure of the mapped operator emerges our first main result: An additive one-body operator only has non-zero matrix elements between eigenstates of the seniority pairing model, if these eigenstates come from the same or adjacent energy levels in the spectrum of the pairing Hamiltonian. With this selection rule it becomes feasible to investigate the strong pairing limit of the Richardson Hamiltonian without relying on the Bethe-Ansatz solvability of the Richardson Hamiltonian. While our aim remains the same as that of previous authors, i.e. to develop a simple and intuitive analytical picture of the low-temperature physics of superconducting metallic nano-grains, the new tools at our disposal allow us to obtain new results:

1. In Section IV we calculated the ground state expectation value of an arbitrary one-body operator for a system of $2N$ electrons in the strong pairing limit. In Section V we showed that the selection rule we identified and used in conjunction with the Dyson mapping also facilitates time-dependent perturbation theory. Here we explicitly perturbed the strong pairing limit with a more general perturbation than the kinetic term in the Richardson Hamiltonian. Results obtained in both calculations show that the likelihood for a perturbation to break up a Cooper pair depends on the number density of Cooper pairs in the system. This is explained by the fact that the electrons that constitute a Cooper pair obey the exclusion principle and underlines that there are circumstances in which Cooper pairs do not behave as bosons.
2. Also in Section IV we calculated the occupation probability of single particle levels in the strong pairing limit. We found that a picture emerges of a competition between the kinetic term that favours a Fermi-sea, and the pairing term that favours a situation where the occupation probabilities of all

one-particle levels are the same. This picture agrees qualitatively with our intuition also for a real superconductor in which the kinetic term cannot be treated as a perturbation. Since there is a smooth transition from the strong pairing limit to more realistic values for the pairing interaction strength, we expect that results such as the non-extensivity of the linear response also holds for the nanograins studied experimentally.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Hannes Kriel for his careful proof reading of the final manuscript. One of us (IS) thanks the National Research Foundation and the Harry Crossley Foundation for funding received while conducting this research. This work is supported through grant GUN2053779 of the NRF. HBG thanks the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington for its partial support, hospitality and conducive working conditions during completion of this work.

APPENDIX: DEGENERATE PERTURBATION THEORY

In this appendix the general formalism is presented in detail, for finding perturbatively the spectra of (possibly non-hermitian) operators if there is degeneracy when the perturbation is switched off. The argument is developed along the lines of the non-degenerate (hermitian) case as treated by Sakurai.²⁰ We could not locate any source that gives a satisfactory treatment of the degenerate case.

We are given an operator $H(\lambda) = H_0 + \lambda H_1$. Neither H_0 nor H_1 have to be hermitian. We assume that H is fully diagonalizable, at least in a finite region around $\lambda = 0$. For $\lambda \neq 0$, we assume that $H(\lambda)$ has a non-degenerate spectrum, so that a single label $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, M$ may be used to specify eigenvalues and eigenvectors uniquely:

$$H(\lambda) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = E_\alpha(\lambda) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with $E_\alpha(\lambda) \neq E_\beta(\lambda)$ if $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $\lambda \neq 0$. The subscript R is used to indicate that we are dealing with right-eigenvectors, later to be contrasted with left-eigenvectors, that do not coincide with the right eigenvectors when $H(\lambda)$ is not hermitian. We take it that all the $E_\alpha(\lambda)$ and $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ are analytical functions of λ in a finite region around $\lambda = 0$. Furthermore, if two eigenvalues converge at $\lambda = 0$, i.e. $E_\alpha(0) = E_\beta(0)$, we assume that these eigenvalues have different first derivatives at $\lambda = 0$. This condition is referred to by saying that all degeneracy is lifted in the first order. At $\lambda = 0$, the spectrum of H may be degenerate. Our notation takes care of this as follows: At $\lambda = 0$ we let M' be the number of distinct eigenvalues of H_0 . We then indicate these distinct eigenvalues of H_0 as $\mathcal{E}_l$, $l = 1, 2, \dots, M'$. We partition the labels $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, M$ into disjoint sets P_l , labeled by integers

$l = 1, 2, \dots, M'$, by defining P_l to be the set of all indices α such that E_α flows to $\mathcal{E}_l$ as λ goes to zero. We can then also define a function p from the index set $1, 2, \dots, M$ to the index set $1, 2, \dots, M'$ as follows: $p(\alpha) = l$ where l is the unique label such that $\alpha \in P_l$. We refer to the space spanned by all eigenvectors of H_0 with eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_l$ as the $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspace of H_0 . It is assumed we know a basis for each $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspace of H_0 . The basis elements that span the $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspace will be denoted $|\psi, l_R\rangle$ where ψ is a discrete index that runs from 1 to some integer ω_l which is the dimension of the $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspace. The set $\{|\psi, l_R\rangle : l = 1, \dots, M'; \psi = 1, \dots, \omega_l\}$ forms a basis for the domain of $H(\lambda)$. It is in terms of these basis states that we want to express the eigenstates of $H(\lambda)$ approximately. Corresponding to this basis we can always find a left basis $\{|\psi, l_L\rangle : l = 1, \dots, M'; \psi = 1, \dots, \omega_l\}$ such that the equations

$$(\psi, l_L | \phi, m_R) = \delta_{l,m} \delta_{\psi,\phi}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

hold for all l, m, ψ and ϕ .

We uniquely define a projection operator Π_l as the linear operator that maps any vector in the $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspace of H_0 onto itself, while mapping any vector that can be written as a linear combination of vectors from the other eigenspaces of H_0 , onto zero. (This might not be an *orthogonal* projection operator though. When H_0 is non-hermitian, there are $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspaces that are not orthogonal to each other.) An operator $\tilde{\Pi}_l$ is defined as $\tilde{\Pi}_l = \text{I} - \Pi_l$. In terms of the states $|\psi, l_L\rangle$ and $|\phi, m_R\rangle$, the identity operator I , the unperturbed operator H_0 and the projection operators Π_l and $\tilde{\Pi}_l$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{I} = \sum_{l=1}^{M'} \sum_{\psi=1}^{\omega_l} |\psi, l_R\rangle (\psi, l_L|, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$H_0 = \sum_{l=1}^{M'} \mathcal{E}_l \sum_{\psi=1}^{\omega_l} |\psi, l_R\rangle (\psi, l_L|, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\Pi_l = \sum_{\psi=1}^{\omega_l} |\psi, l_R\rangle (\psi, l_L|, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\tilde{\Pi}_l = \sum_{k=1 \neq l}^{M'} \sum_{\psi=1}^{\omega_k} |\psi, k_R\rangle (\psi, k_L|, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Note that $\Pi_l \Pi_m = \delta_{lm} \Pi_m$.

With the above preliminaries out of the way we now expand the eigenvalues $E_\alpha(\lambda)$ and eigenvectors $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ of $H(\lambda)$ in terms of λ :

$$\begin{aligned} E_\alpha(\lambda) &= \mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} + \lambda \Delta_\alpha^{(1)} + \lambda^2 \Delta_\alpha^{(2)} + \dots \\ |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda &= \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle + \lambda \left| \alpha_R^{(1)} \right\rangle + \lambda^2 \left| \alpha_R^{(2)} \right\rangle + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This definition fixes the directions of the λ -independent zero'th order eigenvectors $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle_0$ uniquely as the direction to which the α -eigenvector of $H(\lambda)$ converges as

λ goes to zero. This direction is well-defined since we assumed that $H(\lambda)$ has a non-degenerate spectrum for $\lambda \neq 0$. The magnitudes of the eigenvectors are left arbitrary.

The set of eigenvectors $\left\{ \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \right\}_{\alpha=1}^M$ also forms a basis for the domain of $H(\lambda)$. We use it to define a second basis (sometimes called the contra-variant basis) $\left\{ \left| \alpha_L^{(0)} \right\rangle \right\}_{\alpha=1}^M$ through the set of equations

$$\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| \beta_R^{(0)} \right. \right) = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Equation (A.8) implies that $\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| H_0 \right. \right) = \mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| \right. \right)$. Using the states $\left\{ \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \right\}_{\alpha=1}^M$ and functionals $\left\{ \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| \right. \right) \right\}_{\alpha=1}^M$ we define another set of projection operators that will come in handy during our calculations. Define a projection operator

$$\pi_\alpha = \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| \right. \right), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

that singles out the $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ component of the decomposition of any vector in the $\left\{ \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \right\}_{\alpha=1}^M$ basis. Let $\tilde{\pi}_\alpha$ be the complementary projection operator of π_α in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ subspace by setting

$$\tilde{\pi}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in P_{p(\alpha)} \setminus \{\alpha\}} \left| \beta_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \left(\beta_L^{(0)} \left| \right. \right) = \Pi_{p(\alpha)} - \pi_\alpha. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Thus, the identity operator may be decomposed as

$$\text{I} = \tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)} + \tilde{\pi}_\alpha + \pi_\alpha. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The next step is to choose the relative normalization between the eigenstate $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ and $|\alpha_L\rangle_\lambda$. The most convenient choice turns out to be $\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \left| \alpha_R \right\rangle_\lambda \right) = 1$. With this choice it follows that

$$\pi_\alpha |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Now we rewrite the eigenvalue equation in the form

$$(\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - H_0) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\Delta_\alpha(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_\alpha^{(k)} \lambda^k$.

The first thing we do with this equation is multiply it by $\Pi_{p(\alpha)}$, noting that $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} (\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - H_0) = 0$, to find

$$\Pi_{p(\alpha)} (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = 0, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

which has to hold order for order in λ . Note that, by definition, the zero'th order term in the λ -expansion of $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$, namely $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$, is an element of the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$

eigenspace of H_0 and hence $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$. Keeping this in mind, we look at the terms in (A.14) of lowest order in λ to find

$$\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = \Delta_\alpha^{(1)} \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

This eigenvalue equation enables us to find the zero'th order vectors $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ as the eigenvectors of $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1$ in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace. Since we assume all degeneracy to be lifted in the first order, no two eigenvalues $\Delta_\alpha^{(1)}$ and $\Delta_\beta^{(1)}$ with $\alpha, \beta \in P_{p(\alpha)}$ are the same, and (A.15) is necessary and sufficient to determine the various $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace.

In order to proceed, we define an operator

$$Q_k = \sum_{l \neq k} \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{E}_l} \Pi_l. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We return to (A.13) and multiply it with $Q_{p(\alpha)}$, noting that $Q_{p(\alpha)} (\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - H_0) = \tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)}$. Thus we arrive at one of the most important formulas in the present discussion, namely

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)} |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = Q_{p(\alpha)} (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

This equation has, on the left-hand side, the part of the eigenvector $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ that can be written as a linear combination of vectors in $\mathcal{E}_l$ eigenspaces with $l \neq p(\alpha)$. We want a similar equation for that part of $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ that lies inside the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace.

For this purpose, we firstly rewrite (A.14) to read

$$(\Delta_\alpha(\lambda) - \lambda \Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \Pi_{p(\alpha)}) \Pi_{p(\alpha)} |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$$

$$- \lambda \Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)} |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = 0, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

by recalling that $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} + \tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)} = \text{I}$ and $(\Pi_{p(\alpha)})^2 = \Pi_{p(\alpha)}$. Now we substitute (A.17) into the second term of (A.18) to find

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Delta_\alpha(\lambda) - \lambda \Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \Pi_{p(\alpha)}) \Pi_{p(\alpha)} |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda \\ & - \lambda \Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 Q_{p(\alpha)} (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Define an operator

$$q_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in P_{p(\alpha)} \setminus \{\alpha\}} \frac{1}{\Delta_\alpha^{(1)} - \Delta_\beta^{(1)}} \left| \beta_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \left(\beta_R^{(0)} \right|. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Note that $q_\alpha (\Delta_\alpha^{(1)} - \Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \Pi_{p(\alpha)}) = \tilde{\pi}_\alpha$ and that $q_\alpha \Pi_{p(\alpha)} = q_\alpha$. Hence, by multiplying (A.19) with q_α and dividing by λ , note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_\alpha |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda &= q_\alpha H_1 Q_{p(\alpha)} (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_\alpha^{(k+1)} \lambda^k q_\alpha |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

This is the counterpart of (A.17) that we needed for the part of $|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda$ that lies inside the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace. When we combine the results of (A.12), (A.17) and (A.21), remembering that the identity operator may be decomposed as $\text{I} = \tilde{\Pi}_{p(\alpha)} + \tilde{\pi}_\alpha + \pi_\alpha$ we find

$$|\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda = \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle + (1 + q_\alpha H_1) Q_{p(\alpha)} (\lambda H_1 - \Delta_\alpha(\lambda)) |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_\alpha^{(k+1)} \lambda^k q_\alpha |\alpha_R\rangle_\lambda. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Collecting terms of order $N+1$ we find, for $N \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \alpha_R^{(N+1)} \right\rangle &= (1 + q_\alpha H_1) Q_{p(\alpha)} \left\{ H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(N)} \right\rangle - \sum_{M=1}^{N+1} \Delta_\alpha^{(M)} \left| \alpha_R^{(N+1-M)} \right\rangle \right\} \\ &- \sum_{M=2}^{N+2} \Delta_\alpha^{(M)} q_\alpha \left| \alpha_R^{(N+2-M)} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Note that $Q_{p(\alpha)} \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = 0$ and $q_\alpha \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = 0$. Thus, for $N \geq 1$, the upper bounds on the two summations in the above expression may respectively be decreased from $N+1$ to N and from $N+2$ to $N+1$, while for the case where $N=0$, the two summations may be left

out entirely. To complete the expansions, we need an expression for $\Delta_\alpha^{(M)}$. This we find by multiplying (A.13) with the functional $\left(\alpha_R^{(0)} \right|$, recalling our normalization convention $\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \right| \alpha_R \rangle_\lambda = 1$, and collecting terms of order

M in λ to find

$$\Delta_\alpha^{(M)} = \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(M-1)} \right). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Our final results are then:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \alpha_R^{(N+1)} \right\rangle = & (1 + q_\alpha H_1) Q_{p(\alpha)} \left\{ H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(N)} \right\rangle - \sum_{M=1}^N \Delta_\alpha^{(M)} \left| \alpha_R^{(N+1-M)} \right\rangle \right\} \\ & - \sum_{M=2}^{N+1} \Delta_\alpha^{(M)} q_\alpha \left| \alpha_R^{(N+2-M)} \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

and

$$\Delta_\alpha^{(N+1)} = \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(N)} \right). \quad (\text{A.26})$$

It is understood that, in the case where $N = 0$ and the lower bounds of the summations in (A.25) exceed the upper bounds, the summation contains no terms, i.e. $\left| \alpha_R^{(1)} \right\rangle = (1 + q_\alpha H_1) Q_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$. The formulas of (A.25) and (A.26) are all we need to calculate the corrections of order $N + 1$ to both the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of H , if the corrections of orders $0, 1, 2, \dots, N$ are known. Together with the initial conditions provided by the eigenvalue equation

$$\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = \Delta_\alpha^{(1)} \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle \quad (\text{A.27})$$

this allows us to write down in principal the expansion of any eigenvector and its eigenvalue to arbitrary order in λ . Concerning (A.26) for the eigenvalue-correction of order $N+1$, note that $\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 q_\alpha = 0 \right)$. This is true because the states $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ and functionals $\left(\beta_L^{(0)} \middle| \right)$ with $\alpha, \beta \in P_l$ were chosen to diagonalize H_1 in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace, in the sense that $\left(\beta_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle = \Delta_\alpha^{(1)} \delta_{\alpha,\beta}$. This means that, when we substitute from (A.25) for $\left| \alpha_R^{(N)} \right\rangle$ in (A.26), the terms that are multiplied from the left with an operator q_α disappear and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\alpha^{(N+2)} = & \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 Q_{p(\alpha)} H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(N)} \right) \\ & - \sum_{M=1}^N \Delta_\alpha^{(M)} \left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 Q_{p(\alpha)} \middle| \alpha_R^{(N+1-M)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

which is an expression for the eigenvalue-correction, with all the dead-wood cut away. If an unperturbed eigenstate $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ has a non-degenerate eigenvalue, i.e. H_0 does not contain other eigenvectors with the same eigenvalue as $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$, the situation and hence the formulas are simpler

than above. In this case, the proper operator to use for q_α is simply the zero-operator. With this adjustment the general formulas reduce to formulas valid for the specific case of no degeneracy.

Below, we write down explicitly the first order correction to an eigenstate and the second order correction to its eigenvalue, for the general case where degeneracy is present in the unperturbed system:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \alpha_R^{(1)} \right\rangle = & \sum_{l \neq p(\alpha)} \frac{\Pi_l H_1 \left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle}{\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - \mathcal{E}_l} \\ & + \sum_{l \neq p(\alpha)} \sum_{\beta \in P_{p(\alpha)} \setminus \{\alpha\}} \frac{\left(\beta_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 \Pi_l H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right) \left| \beta_R^{(0)} \right\rangle}{(\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - \mathcal{E}_l) (\Delta_\alpha^{(1)} - \Delta_\beta^{(1)})}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

$$\Delta_\alpha^{(2)} = \sum_{l \neq p(\alpha)} \frac{\left(\alpha_L^{(0)} \middle| H_1 \Pi_l H_1 \middle| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right)}{\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)} - \mathcal{E}_l} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Note that the formula for the second order correction to the eigenvalue, (A.30) looks the same for the degenerate case as for the non-degenerate case. The only difference is that, in the degenerate case, the zero'th order eigenvector $\left| \alpha_R^{(0)} \right\rangle$ is a simultaneous eigenvector of H_0 and $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1$, lying in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace, whereas in the non-degenerate case it is uniquely fixed by diagonalizing H_0 .

When we apply this perturbation expansion method in conjunction with the Dyson mapping, there is still the matter of the physical subspace to address. The question is: If we approximate the eigenvectors of $H(\lambda)$ by including only a few terms in the perturbation expansion, do we lose the notion of physical eigenstates that lie exactly in the physical subspace? Recall that if we diagonalize $H(\lambda)$ exactly, we can express the physical subspace as the space spanned by a certain subset of the eigenvectors of $H(\lambda)$. If we only approximate the eigenvectors by the first few terms of their λ expansions, can we still find a subset of these approximate eigenvectors that span

the physical subspace? Or do the λ -expansions for the physical eigenvectors, if truncated after a few terms, only lie close to, but not necessarily in the physical subspace? Perhaps not unexpectedly, the answer is that the approximate physical eigenvectors still lie exactly in the physical subspace. This can be seen as follows. Any operator that leaves the physical subspace invariant is said to be a physical operator. Then if we assume that $H(\lambda)$ is the linear extension of the image of a fermion operator for all λ , it follows that H_0 and H_1 are both physical operators. Furthermore, it is a simple matter to show that the operators Π_l and Q_l are physical operators. This means that $\Pi_l H_1$ is also a physical operator. We find the zero'th order eigenvectors $|\alpha_R^{(0)}\rangle$ by diagonalizing the operator $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1$ in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace of H_0 . Since $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1$ is a physical operator with a non-degenerate spectrum, the eigenvectors thus obtained can be separated into a set that spans the overlap of physical subspace and the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$

eigenspace, and a set of ghost states. Since the operator q_α is defined in such a way that it has the same eigenvectors in the $\mathcal{E}_{p(\alpha)}$ eigenspace as the physical operator $\Pi_{p(\alpha)} H_1$, it follows that q_α is a physical operator. Then, if we start the recursion of (A.16) with a state from the physical sector, the corrections that the recursion generates remain inside the physical subspace. This follows inductively from the fact that higher order corrections in (A.25) are generated by acting with physical operators on lower corrections. If the zero'th order eigenvector is physical, this implies that the first order correction is physical. If the zero'th order eigenvector and the first order correction are both physical, then so too is the second order correction, etc. This implies that the exact physical eigenstates, when expanded in terms of λ , consist of terms that all lie in the physical subspace themselves. Truncating the expansions after a finite number of terms therefore still leaves one in the physical subspace.

* E-mail: isnyman@lorentz.leidenuniv.nl

† E-mail: hbg@sun.ac.za

¹ J. von Delft and D. C. Ralph, Phys. Rep. **345**, 61 (2001).

² I. L. Kurland, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 14886 (2000).

³ R. W. Richardson, Phys. Lett. **3**, 277 (1963).

⁴ R. W. Richardson, Phys. Lett. **5**, 82 (1963).

⁵ E. A. Yuzbashyan, A. A. Baytin, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 214509 (2003).

⁶ J. Dobaczewski, F. G. Scholtz, and H. B. Geyer, Phys. Rev. C **48**, 2313 (1993).

⁷ P. Navratil, H. B. Geyer, and J. Dobaczewski, nucl-th/9405021.

⁸ P. Navratil, H. B. Geyer, and J. Dobaczewski, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 1394 (1995).

⁹ P. Navratil, H. B. Geyer, and J. Dobaczewski, Nucl. Phys. A **607**, 23 (1996).

¹⁰ P. Cejnar and H. B. Geyer, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 044313 (2002).

¹¹ P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980), chap. 9.

¹² A. Klein and E. R. Marshalek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 375 (1991).

¹³ D. J. Thouless, *The Quantum Mechanics of Many-Body Systems* (Academic, London, 1961), p. 101.

¹⁴ G. E. Brown, *Unified Theory of Nuclear Models and Forces, second revised edition* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1967), chap. 7.

¹⁵ I. Snyman, MSc thesis, University of Stellenbosch (2004); nucl-th/0411059.

¹⁶ P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1900 (1958).

¹⁷ H. B. Geyer, C. A. Engelbrecht, and F. J. W. Hahne, Phys. Rev. C **33**, 1041 (1986).

¹⁸ J. Dobaczewski, H. B. Geyer, and F. J. W. Hahne, Phys. Rev. C **44**, 1030 (1991).

¹⁹ G. E. Brown, B. A. Gelman, and T. T. S. Kuo, nucl-th/0409071.

²⁰ J. J. Sakurai (edited by San Fu Tuan), *Modern Quantum Mechanics, revised edition* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994), p. 285.

²¹ This becomes an issue when the finite set of one-particle indices $\mu = -j, \dots, j$ is a subset of a larger (possibly infinite) set of indices. See for instance the example of the particles confined to a ring, discussed in Section V.